

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2013

Members Present: Hillary Cole, Brian Cook, David Carpenter, Nan Chase, David Nutter, Brendan Ross

Members Absent: Ashley Black, J. Ray Elingburg, Tracey Rizzo, Jo Stephenson, Capi Wampler

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Esther Manheimer, Mitchell Miller, Trudy Galynker, Harry Pierson, Robert Griffin, Jeannette Syprzak, Debbie Stoia, Frank Vogler, Nathaniel Neil, David Patterson, Valeria Carrizo, Stephen Wyda

Call to Order: Chair Cole calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Commissioner Nutter asks for a wording change on page 14. Commissioner Nutter moves to adopt the January 9, 2013 minutes with this change.
Second by: Commissioner Chase
Vote for: All

Consent Agenda:

Owner/Applicant: Thirty & Thirty Two All Souls Crescent LLC, Robert Griffin
Subject Property: 32 All Souls Crescent
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013
Historic District: Biltmore Village
PIN: 9647.69-2600
Zoning District: HB
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – Flexible Development Application; Exhibit B – site plan showing proposed sign location; Exhibit C – sheet with detailed sign drawing, rendering of building with sign, and two photographs of sign location; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members.

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30th day of January, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 30th day of January, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits D and E.

HRC Minutes
February 13, 2013

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is for Flexible Development approved to install a 22" x 27" sandblasted wood projecting sign on the north side of the building for a business that has its entrance on the rear/west of the structure. Sign will be suspended by an iron bracket with overall dimensions of 12 sq. ft. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the Guidelines for Signs found in Chapter 6, Book 1, pages 35-42 of the *General Design Guidelines and Policies* of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed signage meets the Biltmore Village Guidelines for projecting signs.
 - b. The rear of the structure is not visible from the public right of way.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant:	Gertrude Galynker
Subject Property:	38 Elizabeth Place
Hearing Date:	February 13, 2013
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.22-7753
Zoning District:	RS-8
Other Permits:	Building & Zoning

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and details the history of the collapsed wall. She explains concrete is necessary for the new wall for structural integrity needs and the tight space where it will be built. She thinks a stone veneer on the front portion is important for the view from the street. She reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: New home constructed in 2009 fronting Elizabeth Place. The parcel is a through - lot between Elizabeth Place and Woodlawn Ave. The retaining wall was on the northwest side (rear/Woodlawn Ave.) of the property adjacent to the neighboring property at 25 Woodlawn Ave.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new poured concrete retaining wall along northwest side of property per attached approved drawings. Wall will have a smooth finish and chamfered edge. Incorporate salvaged rock material into the wall to the extent possible where it is most visible near Woodlawn Ave. Wall will be approximately 2' high near the street and run up to a maximum of 10' 5". All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>Replace in kind any portion of a historic fence or wall that is damaged or deteriorated beyond repair. Match the original in design, configuration, texture, material and color as close as possible. This apparently is not structurally feasible, due to height and location constraints.</p> <p>The guidelines for Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted, provided an effort is made to reuse or incorporate stone in the more visible areas, where the wall is not as high.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant will incorporate salvaged stone into the new wall. 2. The wall runs perpendicular to the street and between two buildings, thus a portion is in the rear yard of both properties.
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Frank Vogler, of V&V Land Management, speaks for the applicant. He shows a storyboard with a survey of the lot, photos of the site, other stone walls in the neighborhood, and wall specifications. He says the wall currently belongs to both neighbors. He explains the survey shows the collapsed part of the wall is on neighbor Anne Bayer's property, but Ms. Bayer has not offered to replace the wall. He notes the wall will face her property. His client, Gertrude Galyunker, has made an agreement with Ms. Bayer that she will finance and rebuild the wall, with no above ground portions of the wall encroaching on Ms. Bayer's property. She says Ms. Bayer understands some of the footers will need to be on her property (<i>not visible</i>) and has agreed to allow access during construction.</p> <p>Mr. Vogler explains the urgent need to rebuild the wall to stabilize the driveway on Ms. Galyunker's property, in order to maintain the viability of her additional lot. He says one of her cars has been stranded at the top of the driveway since the</p>

	<p>wall collapsed July 11, 2012.</p> <p>Mr. Vogler describes the wall that collapsed, noting it was poorly constructed, was only 1' thick with no footings, batter, or backfilling, and consisted of over 2/3 as much mortar as stone. As the wall got steeper, less and less stone was used. He suspects the stone that was used may have come from Reed Creek. It has been crumbling as they move it. As a result there is very little salvageable stone. He would rather use new stone, Hooper's Creek, for any veneer required on the new wall.</p> <p>Mr. Vogler describes plans for the new wall. He explains it will be professionally constructed of concrete, with adequate footing and backfill. He thinks a graduated veneer detail spanning between 12' and 16' would look the most appropriate and keep it from looking as though the stone wall stops abruptly.</p>
--	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Cole notes the guidelines concerning maintenance of stone walls, and asks if there were concerns about this wall before the collapse. Mr. Vogler replies his client was unaware of the wall's problems before its collapse, the trees planted on top and the alley-like space between the wall and the neighbor's house obscured the view.

Commissioners Carpenter asks if the portion of a stone wall visible in the photographs at the front of the driveway will remain. Mr. Vogler says yes, and he wants to match the new wall's veneer details to this wall as close as possible. Commissioner Carpenter thinks this wall is the precedent and should guide the design for the new wall, not concrete ones in the neighborhood.

Chair Cole asks about the width of the new wall, Mr. Vogler says it will be no more than 18". She has concerns about a new, bright concrete look, Mr. Vogler says he can either choose a darker Portland cement, or color another to be darker, aiming for a dark gray color. It will have a smooth finish.

Commissioners Nutter, Chase and Carpenter discuss how much wall would be visible from the street, stone, color and mortar choices, and how far back the veneer treatment is needed. Ms. Merten suggests the applicant use as much salvaged stone as possible, and this could help dictate how far the veneer should extend. Mr. Vogler agrees, and says he can cut the stones if needed.

Commissioner Carpenter suggests Hooper's Creek stone, if new stone is used. Commissioner Cook states he was first leaning towards only using salvaged stone, but now thinks it would be better to find stone that matches the other wall near the front of the driveway. Mr. Vogler says he intends to match the mortar joints on that wall as much as possible, and it would be best if the stone could be agreed on later, to let the concrete part of the project move along. Several commissioners agree.

Owner Harry Pierson, husband of Trudy Galyner, says the photographs are misleading. The collapsed debris makes more area visible than when the wall was standing. The wall was only six feet from Ms. Bayer's house, so the view was more like looking down an alley. He says there was no view of the majority of the wall from the street, and they could not tell it was damaged. Commissioner Carpenter asks if they plan to do any landscaping, noting trees contributed to the collapse. Mr. Pierson says they have no intention of creating another problem, and will only use small shrubs or plants.

Trudy Galyner notes two-thirds of the driveway has been cut away to stabilize the site, and when the wall is rebuilt it will not be very visible, as before.

Mr. Vogler asks to amend his application to conform to the engineering documents on the storyboard he has brought to the meeting (replacing Exhibit D).

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – eight photographs of site before collapse, during collapse, and after clean-up and stabilization; Exhibit D – two detail drawings of back fill retaining walls by F. Ungert of Medlock & Associates (4'0" and 10'0"); Exhibit E – six photos showing concrete retaining wall examples in Montford; Exhibit F – two photos of poured concrete wall examples; Exhibit G – detail photo of wall in Albemarle Park; Exhibit H – storyboard with survey, photos of site, and two engineering drawings of proposed wall (*submitted 2/13/13*); and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except Commissioner Carpenter;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30th day of January, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 30th day of January, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits I and J.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to replace a collapsed stone wall by constructing a new poured concrete retaining wall along the northwest side of property per attached approved drawings. Wall will have a smooth finish and chamfered edge and will incorporate new rock material to match existing wall, extending at maximum from the street to the southeast corner of the house at 25 Woodlawn Ave. Wall will be approximately 2' high near the street and run up to a maximum of 10'5". **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Fences and Walls found on pages 36-37 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a) The applicant will attempt to match the original wall's texture, color and material as close as possible.
 - b) The wall is sited as close as possible to the original location.
 - c) The wall runs perpendicular to the street and between two buildings, thus a portion is in the rear yard of both properties.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following condition:

1. Applicant returns to March 13, 2013 meeting to present detailed drawings, samples and specifications for the stone veneer, including existing stones, storyboard, new stone and mortar type and color, extent and spacing.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Thomas Wolfe
Subject Property: 5 Cullowhee St.
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.03-5232
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten explains this is new construction, and a Preliminary Review was conducted at the January 2013 meeting. She has received comment from one neighbor about the expanse of exposed foundation in the rear. She thinks the applicant should provide a way to break up this expanse, either with plantings or windows. She shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant lot from the subdivision and recombination of the two adjacent lots which front on Pearson and Montford Ave.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new 2 story, 1,488 sq. ft. single family structure with recessed front porch per the attached approved plans. The new structure will have a stucco covered concrete block foundation. The first story will be fiber cement lapped siding with 6" reveal. The 2nd story will have wood shingles. The roof will be hipped with a clipped gable on front and rear and exposed rafter ends with a 24" overhang. Asphalt shingles will be medium to dark in color. Details include brackets, 6" corner boards and 4" window and door surrounds of MiraTEC. The Porch will have T&G ceiling and flooring, with 2"x2" turned rails on balustrade. Windows will be wood, double hung, 2over 1, SDL. Remove three trees in front of structure to construct concrete walk and gravel driveway. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please indicate species of trees to be planted along the driveway. 2. Consider adding foundation vegetation on rear of structure to soften exposed foundation. <p>The guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 and the Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration. 2. The parking is located to the side of the structure due to the small size and slope of the rear yard.
Applicant(s)	<p>Aaron Wilson, architect, offers to answer questions about the project. He submits samples of siding (smooth side hardi-plank and cedar), and roof materials.</p> <p>Commissioner Chase says she thinks plantings would be better than windows if the lowest level is only used as a crawl space. Mr. Wilson says it is currently designed as a crawl space, but there is a good chance the buyer may ask for a basement. He shows a sketch of the rear elevation that includes windows and doors on the basement level. He says there is enough drop off there to excavate. Chair Cole asks if there would be a concrete stoop (<i>yes</i>).</p> <p>Mr. Wilson asks what process he would need to follow to make the change to a basement with windows and a door. Ms. Merten answers he would have to come back for review if the basement is requested, adding plantings to screen the foundation could be made a condition of the current application.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Cole asks if there are plans for any trees. Mr. Wilson asks about the approved species list, and if he could bring that back for staff approval (*yes*). Commissioner Cole asks for details about the material samples. There is discussion of a color palette, Ms. Merten explains the roof must be medium to dark but other colors are not regulated.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction worksheet; Exhibit B – eight pages of specifications for windows, shingles, doors, stucco, siding, and trim; Exhibit C – three photos of existing drive showing slopes and property line; Exhibit D – site plan; Exhibit E – floor plans; Exhibit F – front and rear perspective drawings; Exhibit G – southeast, northwest, northeast and southwest elevations; Exhibit H – samples of hardi-plank siding, cedar shingles, and roof shingles (*submitted 2/13/13*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30th day of January, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of

the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 30th day of January, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits I and J.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct a new 2 story, 1,488 sq. ft. single family structure with recessed front porch per the attached approved plans. The new structure will have a stucco covered concrete block foundation. The first story will be fiber cement lapped siding with 6" reveal, smooth side exposed. The 2nd story will have cedar wood shingles. The roof will be hipped with a clipped gable on front and rear and exposed rafter ends with a 24" overhang. Asphalt shingles will be medium to dark in color. Details include brackets, 6" corner boards and 4" window and door surrounds of MiraTEC. The Porch will have T&G ceiling and flooring, with 2"x2" turned rails on balustrade. Windows will be wood, double hung, 2over 1, SDL. Remove three trees in front of structure to construct concrete walk and gravel driveway. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 and the Guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new structure is compatible with the surrounding historic buildings in the district in terms of siting, materials, scale, texture, and fenestration.
 - b. The parking is located to the side of the structure due to the small size and slope of the rear yard.
 - c. Vegetation will be added to screen the foundation on the rear elevation.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following conditions:

1. **Landscape plan including evergreen screening on rear elevation and evergreen species along the driveway be submitted to staff for approval.**
2. **Roof color be submitted to staff for approval.**

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Cook

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Nathaniel Neil/Debbie Stoia
Subject Property: 87 St. Dunstan's Road
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648.51-1974
Zoning District: RS-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and discusses the features of each elevation, and their visibility. She notes the proposed window installation is on a non-character defining façade which is not prominent from the right-of-way. She has met the applicants at the site to discuss possible changes to their design that would adhere to the guidelines. She reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: This is an asymmetrical two-story shingled boxy house form which has exposed carved rafters and features a rough-cut stone interior and exterior chimney as well as a stone foundation with grapevine mortar joints. There is a two-story projecting central block with a one-story full-façade porch with square porch posts adorned with curved brackets. Windows throughout are one-over-one with the upper sash having geometric tracery. Windows on the façade are found in pairs, threes and fours while side elevation windows are singles and pairs.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: 1) Remove existing shed addition and add new 19' 6" x 8' 10" addition on northwest corner of structure per attached plans. Addition will have hipped roof with architectural shingles in medium gray color to match future replacement roof color. Foundation will be (). New wood shingles painted to match existing. Salvage two windows to be reused on addition. Add two new wood, one over one, windows and wood entrance door per attached specifications. 2) Reconfigure opening on side of structure to allow a smaller window to be installed. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please describe foundation materials for new addition. 2. Window changes should not be made on character defining elevations 3. Wrap around addition is somewhat unusual – consider increasing size of proposed addition to the rear vs. wrapping around. <p>The guidelines for Additions found on pages 82-83 and the Guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 78-79 in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan's Historic, adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval provided concerns are addressed.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons: None</p>
-----------------------	---

Applicant(s)	Debbie Stoia, Interior Designer, submits a new drawing showing the addition in relation to the existing structure, and three photos of the house and driveway. She explains the needs of the homeowner and constraints posed by limited space between the house and driveway. There is no powder room on the main floor, the laundry is currently in the basement, and the driveway area is very tight.
---------------------	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Cole asks for clarification of the dimensions and the roof overhang (addition including overhang extends 6'2" from main house). She asks if other options have been considered. Ms. Stoia says the roofline would be identical in form to the porch roof. She has considered using a stacked laundry to save space. Commissioner Cook asks if the water heater location could be changed, since additions are supposed to be inset. Commissioner Carpenter asks if she could extend the space towards the driveway to recapture the interior space needed for the laundry. Property owner Nathaniel Neil says he is open to reconfiguring the driveway. Ms. Merten says the driveway change could be a separate Minor Work application. Ms. Stoia says she will consider other designs for the interior and the window placement.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – three photographs of existing building; Exhibit C – site plan; Exhibit D – floor plan and two renderings showing addition's rear and side elevations; Exhibit E – three photographs of existing structure with notes; Exhibit F – drawing and photograph of side elevation; Exhibit G – window and door specifications; Exhibit H – revised rendering showing addition in relation to the main structure (*submitted 2/13/13*); Exhibit I – three photographs of the existing structure and driveway (*submitted 2/13/13*); Exhibit J – architectural shingle sample – and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 30th day of January, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 30th day of January, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits K and L.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to 1) Remove existing shed addition and add new addition on southwest corner of structure per revised plans. Addition will have hipped roof with architectural shingles in medium gray color to match future replacement roof color. Foundation will be slab. New wood shingles painted to match existing. Salvage two windows to be reused on addition. Add two new wood, one over one, windows and wood entrance door per attached specifications. 2) Reconfigure opening on side of structure to allow a smaller window, salvaged from original structure, to be installed. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Additions found on pages 82-83 and the Guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 78-79 in the Design Review Guidelines for the St. Dunstan's Historic, adopted on September 12, 2012, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. New addition will be inset and on the rear elevation, not visible from the front elevation.
 - b. The window installation is on a non-character defining façade which is not prominent from the right-of-way.
 - c. Appropriate scale, roofline, materials and style are being used for the addition.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the St. Dunstan's Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Cook

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following condition:

1. Revised drawings be submitted to staff for approval.

Motion by: Commissioner Cook

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Chair Cole calls for a short break at 6:05. Hearing resumes at 6:12.

Preliminary Review:

Owner/Applicant: Jeanette Syprazak
Subject Property: 41 Starnes Ave.
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-8325
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report. Property Description: Dr. Eugene B. Glenn House. Early 20th century 2 1/2 story vernacular Queen Anne dwelling. Turned porch posts, sawn ornament, multiple gables, asbestos siding. 1906-1907 (D)
-----------------------	--

	<p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct New Porch. Rebuild rear stair and construct new deck. Construct new accessory building. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2nd level decks are not allowed per the guidelines. 2. Skylights should not be visible from a primary right of way. 3. Need before photos or drawings of area where new porch is proposed 4. Proposed garage/office is not in keeping with the primary structure or other carriage houses in the district. <p>The guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, the Guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, and the guidelines for Roofs found on pages 74-75 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Review and provide applicant appropriate feedback.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Property owner Jeannette Syprzak describes the existing property and her proposed changes and offers to answer questions. She says the existing back stairs are very steep. She did not know a 2nd story deck was not allowed and does not mind taking that out of her design. She would still need stairs from the 2nd story door, with a small landing and roof.</p> <p>Ms. Syprzak's property had been four units, but now only three are allowed by P&Z, she has a non-conforming lot (too small). She has to combine two units and will need an exit in the rear.</p> <p>Ms. Syprzak shows a rendering of her house and the new house next door. Chair Cole asks if a view from the street could be produced from the same model (<i>perhaps</i>). She questions the need for two sets of stairs coming from the porch. Ms. Syprzak answers she wants to fence part of the lot for her dog, and wants to be able to go to either the front or back of the property from the porch.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Cole asks the Commissioners to comment on the two sets of stairs from the porch. Commissioner Nutter says it reminds him of Charleston, Chair Cole says it should be remind him of Montford. Ms. Merten says a side porch with stairs to the front is not customary, though she admits there may be examples. Commissioner Nutter says his house on Flint Street has two sets of stairs, but Ms. Merten notes one is for the front entrance and this is not the same situation.

Commissioner Cook says the drawings will need more details on the porch, and asks about the railings and columns. Ms. Syprzak says her front porch has turned columns, but she would like to use straight, not-turned ones on the porch. She thinks this would distinguish the porch as an addition, be simpler, and not compete with the front of the house. She would be willing to add brackets. Ms. Merten reads from the guidelines, which call for matching details. Commissioner Cook notes as a late-Victorian home, it would have considerable details. Ms. Merten says perhaps the scale could be different, but Commissioner Cook is not sure, he notes many of the modern stock turned columns look too spindly. Ms. Syprzak agrees. She says she would not be able to find columns to match the front porch, Commissioner Cook says there are local resources for custom turned posts.

Concerning the garage, Ms. Spyrzak disagrees with Ms. Merten's assessment. She thinks the garage design is compatible with nearby structures and her existing Cape Cod style garage. Chair Cole notes it should be compatible with the main property structure in form, materials and details. Ms. Spyrzak argues the materials are compatible, and also the form, since she has gable roofs. Commissioner Cook says the shed dormer is a problem, is not compatible with the house, and suggests replacing with a gable form. He thinks the side view gable is fine. Ms. Merten adds the bump outs on the roof line are awkward, Ms. Spyrzak agrees.

Ms. Spyrzak asks about providing something to cover the door entry. Ms. Merten asks if she could put the door on the side, Ms. Spyrzak replies she wants it to keep the whole side area as private as possible, she is planning on having someone work for her and work in that space. Commissioner Chase asks if this is a home business, Ms. Spyrzak replies since she is within one mile of the Downtown district an office space is okay. She says under P&Z directives it cannot be an apartment, but they will allow office space on the first floor with storage on the second level. She is not sure about the footprint restrictions, needs to check. She wonders if she may be able to get a variance on the footprint, says she has had conflicting directives.

Ms. Spyrzak asks if a garage has to have two separate doors, Ms. Merten says this is not an HRC requirement, but she will have to comply with building codes. Chair Cole notes the garage doors are too plain, Ms. Spyrzak says she understands this. Ms. Merten gives ideas for placement of a door. Ms. Spyrzak notes none of the structure is visible from a street. Commissioner Chase asks if the garage could be a separate, later application. Ms. Merten tells Ms. Spyrzak that the guidelines for accessory structures are currently under review and could change. She says she is aware of this.

Ms. Spyrzak notes she needs to find out if she has to have another handicap accessible design for the bathroom. Commissioner Chase notes the plans strongly suggest a living space, and this is a concern. The two porches would not be on a garage, and the plans do not indicate anything that would fit the guidelines. Ms. Merten says the design could be altered to comply, and the garage portion could be continued if it needed changes. Commissioner Cook says the scale is okay, but the style is not. Chair Cole suggests looking at existing carriage houses or garages in the district.

Chair Cole and Ms. Merten detail items the applicant will need for the final hearing:

- Details of the stairs, railings, columns
- Close-up photos of existing details on front porch
- Detailed fence specifications
- Landscaping plans
- New plans for garage, with roof line, porches, door changes, exact dimensions
- Garage door specifications
- Examples of two-exit stair porches in district, if included in final plans
- Storyboard showing neighboring structures, views from streets, etc.

Montford resident David Patterson notes the size of the garage/office structure in the drawing indicates it would be 864 sq.ft., not 700. He asks if the application will be for an accessory structure, if so this size would not comply with UDO size requirements. Ms. Merten notes the HRC has flexibility concerning size of accessory structures. Mr. Patterson replies it would be better if the HRC and the UDO had the same requirements and terminology.

6:30 Commissioner Nutter leaves.

Pre-Preliminary Review (unscheduled):

Owner/Applicant: Valeria Carrizo & Stephen Wyda
Subject Property: Triangular lot, corner of Montford Avenue / W. Chestnut Street
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.02-9547-00000
Zoning District: RM8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Applicant(s)	<p>Ms. Carrizo and Mr. Wyda show renderings of the house they would like to build on the vacant triangular lot. They describe it as a two-story Tudor design, with Vernacular elements. They want to build something that fits in the historic district, but is also unique. They understand their design does not match nearby houses, but note there are Tudor style houses in other parts of Montford.</p> <p>Mr. Wyda says they are pushing the house back from the front setback requirement, to follow the line of other houses on the street. He asks if the stairs from a deck also have to be inset, Chair Cole says this is sometimes allowed.</p>
---------------------	--

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Carpenter asks if the applicants are wedded to the house, or the site (*they answer both*). He says the style does not fit Montford Avenue, but might fit into the Tacoma Circle area. He notes that area is a separate neighborhood, Montford Hills. Ms. Merten says there is a mix of styles throughout the district. Chair Cole asks Attorney Ashley about the Beaufort, NC ruling concerning style. Attorney Ashley says that case directed the district as a whole be considered. She notes, however, that Montford Avenue is a gateway to the district, and thus may deserve special consideration.

Commissioners agree the house has an attractive design, but debate its appropriateness for the site. They say it has several major form issues. There are concerns with the sweeping roof, and the mix of materials, and the way they are mixed. They point out the house will have three primary, very visible facades, and this will require extra attention

Mr. Wyda says variation in Montford is what makes it a great place. He thinks guidelines #4 and #5 are in conflict with each other. Chair Cole disagrees, and notes that a new structure has to be compatible with surrounding ones. She reiterates that special attention needs to be given to the three visible sides, and this is done on all corner lots. Ms. Merten says all sides of new structures are scrutinized.

Ms. Carrizo notes there will be soon be changes to the church across the street, and they want to address the other sides of the streets and also the corner in their process. She notes other houses across the street are very large, and they want to reflect this scale. Commissioner Ross asks if the interior fits their needs (*yes*), and says the outside is easy to adjust.

Attorney Ashley remarks that orientation on a lot is often a major point of concern for neighbors. She says it will be good to show the intended placement in relation to neighboring houses. Mr. Wyda and Ms. Carrizo say they have been taking this into consideration, and are also looking at landscaping and driveway placement that will help.

Other Business:

Committee on Montford Accessory Guidelines. Montford Neighborhood Association president David Patterson asks about progress made by the committee formed to review the current Montford guidelines on accessory structures. Chair Cole states she is waiting for Michael McDonough to rewrite his suggestions to relate to specific guideline changes, they have agreed to submit a draft to Ms. Merten by February 18. After this the entire committee will meet to review the suggested changes. Mr. Patterson notes there is urgency due to neighborhood concerns over a recent application (116 Flint St.). Ms. Merten notes that application was reviewed as a single family structure by the UDO, since the lot is zoned multi-family, and the inside use was for living space. The HRC looked at it as an accessory structure.

Discussion of notices for Preliminary Review. Ms. Merten reports she had hoped her existing budget could absorb the cost of mailing notices of preliminary hearings to nearby property owners, but she has been told this may not be possible. Chair Cole suggests the Montford Neighborhood Association might want to submit a letter saying they could help with these costs. Preliminary hearings are currently included in the information sent to the Montford list-serv and newsletter. They are also listed in the monthly Asheville Citizen-Times legal notice.

National Register nomination – Barrett Farm, Weaverville . Ms. Merten reports she and three commissioners Ross, Stephenson and Carpenter visited the property on January 30, and all who were on the tour agreed it was notable as an extant working farm. Ms. Merten's only concern is the weakness of the statement of significance on the application, although she thinks the necessary details and a strong argument for inclusion are spread throughout the application. In addition, some of the wording regarding the site was incorrect and she has some suggested changes. She has spoken with Annie McDonald of the SHPO, who agrees the farm should be on the National Register. Ms. Merten recommends the HRC submit these comments to the SHPO, and given those changes the HRC is in support of the nomination. All agree.

Certified Local Government Grant Endorsement. Ms. Merten reports she is writing a grant for the Preservation Plan, and needs the HRC's endorsement. Commissioner Chase moves to endorse, all are in favor.

Update on the Albemarle Park Arcadia book project. Ms. Merten reports the book proposal was accepted and she and Robert Sauer were able to negotiate a higher royalty rate (10%). The deadline for completion is in December.

Preservation Society's House Tour, February 23 and 24. Commissioner Ross invites everyone to tour her home, Stratford Towers, which will be included in the tour.

Commissioner Chase moves to adjourn the meeting.
Second by: Commissioner Ross
Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 7:40 pm.